

Remarks

Claims 1-11 and 13-21 are pending. Claims 1-11 and 13-21 are rejected.

Claims 1, 4, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,222,458 (Harris). Claims 8 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harris. Claims 2 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harris in view of U.S. Pat. No. 4,498,193 (Richardson). Claims 3, 5-6 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harris in view of WO 98/34412 (Geyra). Claims 10 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harris in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,570,689 (Kushita).

With regard to claim 1, Harris does not teach broadcasting the plurality of noise signals from different locations into the region such that telecommunications is inhibited in the overlap of the broadcasted signals. Instead, Harris states that

Yet another modification of the FIG. 2 embodiment includes a short-range jammer 220 within the protected area 200. If a jammer is used, the shielding can be less complete. The jammer is placed close to the shield, e.g., under the shielded roof as shown.

The jammer operates by sweeping across all the cellular phone frequencies of interest. For example, a triangle wave generator 222 can be used to drive a varactor diode 224 configured as a tuner part, to sweep across all the frequencies. The jammer is driven by white or pink noise from noise generator 226. RF transmitter 228 transmits white or pink noise across the entire frequency band over which cellular phones transmit and receive.

Harris, col. 3, ll. 41-53.

Harris does not broadcast the plurality of noise signals from different locations. Harris only discloses a single short-range jammer 220. As such, Harris cannot disclose that telecommunications is inhibited in the overlap of the broadcasted noise signals.

Claims 2-11 depend from claim 1. For the reasons claim 1 is patentable, claims 2-11 are patentable.

For the reasons claim 1 is patentable, claim 13 is patentable.

Claims 14-21 depend from claim 13. For the reasons claim 13 is patentable, claims 14-21 are patentable.

Applicants' Attorney submits that the claims are in a condition for allowance. Applicants' Attorney respectfully requests a notice to that effect. Applicants' Attorney also invites a telephone conference if Examiner believes that it will advance the prosecution of this application.

Please charge any fees or credit any overpayments as a result of the filing of this paper to our Deposit Account No. 02-3978.

Respectfully submitted,

BRIAN L. AREND ET AL.

By /Benjamin C. Stasa/
Benjamin C. Stasa
Reg. No. 55,644
Attorney for Applicants

Date: November 7, 2007

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351